

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Regarding the rejection of the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) that the term “computer-readable storage device” is not properly supported within the specification, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Paragraph [42] from the originally-filed specification is reproduced below as follows:

[42] A “computer-readable medium” for purposes of embodiments of the present invention may be any medium that can contain, store, communicate, propagate, or transport the program for use by or in connection with the instruction execution system, apparatus, system or device. The computer readable medium can be, by way of example only but not by limitation, an electronic, magnetic, optical, electromagnetic, infrared, or semiconductor system, apparatus, system, device, propagation medium, or computer memory.

Paragraph [42] clearly states that a “computer-readable medium . . . can store . . . the program . . . by or in connection with . . . [a] device”. Thus, the term “computer-readable storage device” is supported by the specification as a type of “computer-readable medium”. Further, the term “computer-readable storage device” is well-known and is a commonly used term in software claims drafting and should not require a definition in the specification.

Claims 1, 17 and 19 are the only independent claims. Each of these independent claims includes a limitation not disclosed by or made obvious in view of the prior art.

Kuo does not teach sending two sequence numbers to initiate resetting of a sequence number at a receiver. Rather, Kuo uses a Protocol Data Unit (PDU) of a specific type in order to indicate a reset (a Reset PDU). Kuo at col. 1, lines 47-54. The Reset PDU is of several or many bytes in size (Kuo at col. 1, lines 15-35) and the sequence number included in the PDU is one bit. Kuo at col. 1, lines 22-24.

Thus, Kuo teaches away from the present invention since Kuo’s approach is the “out of band” sequence number resetting discussed in the background section of the present specification. See Specification at paragraph [11]. In Kuo, the sequence number values have

nothing to do with resetting the sequence number. Rather, a PDU of a certain type field 14 is identified as a Reset PDU and the resetting operation is initiated solely on this basis without any regard to the value of the sequence number (which can only be 0 or 1). Thus the limitation, at least, of “sending the starting sequence number to cause resetting of the receiver to the starting sequence number” is not disclosed or made obvious.

Also, Kuo’s use of a single-bit sequence number doesn’t allow a condition “wherein a sequence number is acceptable if it is within a group of sequence numbers defined with respect to the expected sequence number” as recited in the claims. For example, if the current sequence number is 0 then the expected sequence number is 1. There is no “group” of sequence numbers that is acceptable that can be defined with respect to the expected sequence number, 1, since there are no other possible numbers. Likewise for the case when the expected sequence number is 0.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present claims are in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly sought. The undersigned may be contacted at the telephone number below at the Examiner’s convenience if it would help in the prosecution of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

TRELLIS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PC

Date: October 10, 2008

By /Charles J. Kulas/
Charles J. Kulas
Reg. No. 35,809
Tel.: 415-279-5098